

The People

An Anti-Suffrage Magazine

Second Year

September, 1914

Number Three



THERE is a serious aspect of the suffrage joke about the much desired increase of wages certain to result from Votes for Women; it will certainly be found that Votes for Women won't have any such effect.





"The Oldest Tea Room in New York"

The Fernery

22 EAST 33rd STREET

(Between Fifth and Madison Avenues)

TEL. 2297 M H

TABLE D'HOTE OR A LA CARTE 8 A. M. TO 8 P. M.

Special Luncheon, 65c.
Breakfast, 35c., 50c.

Club Dinner, 50c. to \$1.00
Tea with Waffles, 30c.

MISS S. M. TUCKER, Prop.

Always quiet and restful, though within 1 block of Altman's, the Waldorf, the subway.

J. B. Thill

and

Mrs. Edmond W. Bodine

Real Estate

192 Main Street
NEW ROCHELLE, N. Y.
Telephone 848

30 East Forty-Second Street
NEW YORK CITY
Telephone 6364 Murray Hill

TWO IMPORTANT ANTI-SUFFRAGE BOOKS

An Englishwoman's Home

Crown 8 vo.
Price by mail, 50c.
By M. E. S.

Mixed Herbs

A Working Woman's Remonstrance
Against the Suffrage
Agitation

Crown 8 vo.
Price by mail, 75c.
By the Same Author

London, Sampson Low, Marston & Co., Ltd.
Agent for United States

THE REPLY

27 William St. New York



Oh! Lady will you stop
At the "Little Vanity Shop?"

Take a Peep at

Blouses, Gowns

Fresh from Paris

THE LITTLE VANITY SHOP

346 Madison Avenue

AT 44TH STREET

NEW YORK

One Block from Grand Central Station

Parcel Post makes shopping by mail easy. Why not write, as well as visit our advertisers.

The Reply

Edited and Published by Helen S. Harman-Brown

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 27 WILLIAM STREET, NEW YORK CITY

Subscription Price: \$1 Per Year; 10 Cents the Copy

Entered as second-class matter May 9, 1914, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y.,
under the Act of March 3, 1879

The Reply is on sale at Brentano's, Fifth Avenue and Twenty-seventh Street, New York,
and at Brentano's, Twelfth and F Streets, Washington

EDITORIAL

At this time of needed funds for the war sufferers what are our American Suffragists doing? Noble work, indeed! We see a "Peace Parade," ostensibly composed of all classes of women—for and against Woman Suffrage—but the organizers and leaders of this farce bear the familiar names of our good Suffrage advertisers. The cost of this ineffectual exhibition was reported by the newspapers to have been \$800.

On the same day, at Newport, we read that \$10,000 was contributed by the "American Militants" for a campaign of blackmail against the Members of Congress who dare to oppose equal suffrage, and from Washington now comes the news that the greater part of the \$50,000 Woman Suffrage campaign fund has been raised by "self sacrifice," to be used for—what? To emancipate the American Women from Slavery! To secure justice for the American Women! On the face of it, nonsense, and an assumption that the American Woman—that freest human being on God's earth—has no sense of humor, or appreciation of her existing

advantages. As we go to press but \$77,000 has been raised for the Red Cross Society's work, and for the first time in history our newspapers have felt obliged to comment upon the slowness of our response to the cry for help.

\$60,000 to be wasted, while brave men, and women, too, (Oh, Champion of your sex!), suffer untold agony!

As during the war of the Rebellion "the conduct of those who later entered the Suffrage movement hindered the public work of women from the time of organized effort for the slave until slavery fell" (Helen K. Johnson), so now is the same selfishness exhibited by their successors.

We note, too, that while the eyes of all are fixed upon Europe, and the truly patriotic men and women are working for the sufferers there, our embryonic female politician is taking advantage of their abstraction to get in closer touch with those politicians whose prospective campaign funds are not such that they might not look favorably upon a contribution of \$60,000 in return for their endorsement of Woman Suffrage.

THE REPLY

"We are working for Suffrage, and more, we are teaching women how to use the ballot when they get it."

The banner inscribed with these words waving over a speaker from a cart at the corner of Wall and Broad streets did not shelter a woman pleading for the vote but a member of the Socialist party making his plea for Social Revolution, and that plea included one for "Men and women to join the Socialist party." The Suffragists are daily denying any alliance with the Socialists. How is it that they allow this public acknowledgment of their debt to the party of Revolution? This is but a repetition of the old story blazoned upon the Socialist banner carried in the Suffragist parade nearly two years ago in Washington. "1,000,000 Socialists work for Woman Suffrage!"

Editorial comment on the following "victory of the Suffragists (?)" seems superfluous, but it is fitting that the report of an eye witness to the proceedings of the recent convention of the Federation of Women's Clubs should be presented to our readers. Contrary to the usual custom, which is to reserve routine business until the closing days of a convention, Mrs. Pennypacker, of Texas, the President of the Federation, who had opened the convention on Thursday, gave notice on Friday that on the following morning (Saturday) the Resolution endorsing Woman Suffrage would be considered. A half hour each morning having been assigned to the business before the convention, every seat, on Saturday, was filled, as the Suffragists had evidently been well instructed. After the

motion was made Mrs. Leache of Kentucky and Miss Lutie Stearns of Wisconsin spoke for it. Many women who were standing tried to get recognition from the chair, when Mrs. Pennybacker recognized Mary Garrett Hay, who at once moved the previous question which was carried, and thus all debate was shut off. After the main question was carried, a rising vote was called for and ignored. It is understood on equally good authority that the Chicago women had notified the President, Mrs. Pennybacker, that the resolution *must* go through and that if it did not they would put up an opposing candidate. This is the "Representative Body" of women which proposes to go to the highest courts in the land and demand the franchise, presumably on the ground that such voters will benefit the country!

A business man of Denver, Mr. J. B. Malin, explains the coal fields war in Colorado by referring to the State Government, if such it may be called, as "weakened by thirty years of woman suffrage, which has resulted in eliminating the strong and placing the weak in office, and in conditions which need only a Mother Jones to start a real war, with militiamen slain from ambush and women and children caught in the cross-fire of strikers and troops."

There seems to be no objection to Adolph Lewisohn's agreeing with George Creel, or George Creel's agreeing with Adolph Lewisohn, as to the benevolent effect of female suffrage on the home; a few new mutual admiration societies more or less really don't matter.

Militant Suffragism

[From The Anti-Suffrage Review of July, 1914]

Woman Suffrage as conceived by its earliest advocates in Great Britain was to be a moral force. To-day in the minds of the great mass of the people of the country it is synonymous with militancy. When the subject was first seriously mooted the position of women in this kingdom left much to be desired. The aim of John Stuart Mill, since acclaimed as the father of the Woman Suffrage movement, was to secure the emancipation of woman from the shackles of legal disabilities and social prejudices which affected her personal liberties. He believed that the only method of obtaining that emancipation was by granting women the parliamentary vote. His belief has been shown to be wrong, for since the appearance in 1869 of "The Subjection of Women," practically all the grievances which Mill had in mind have been removed—without the vote. But an academic movement having for its ostensible end what Mill desired only as a means lingered on and provided an intermittent interest for a number of doctrinaires who were able to ventilate their hobby in Parliament, but failed entirely to appeal to the imagination of the bulk of either the women or the men of the country. Associated with Mrs. Fawcett, whose name had always been prominent in the Woman Suffrage movement, was Mrs. Pankhurst. The time came when it was decided that the movement was not making headway, and Mrs. Pankhurst conceived the idea of forcing from the elec-

torate by violence what it would not concede from conviction. Mrs. Fawcett could not bring herself to participate personally in militancy, but, concerned only with the advertisement it gave her cause, and not with its moral aspect, she gave her blessing to the initial efforts of the Militants by according them a public welcome on their release from prison. Many explosions have since followed from the train of gunpowder which Mrs. Fawcett lighted in 1906. Street rioting gave place to window-breaking campaigns; from the destruction of windows the Militant Suffragists passed to the destruction of houses and churches, until the system has been so perfected that in the ranks of the advocates of Woman Suffrage are to be found bands of women who can apparently be hired for any purpose from church brawling to the placing of bombs.

It is symptomatic of the political acumen of the leaders of the Woman Suffrage movement in 1906 that they should have imagined that individual acts of violence could intimidate the nation into a course to which it was opposed. Only short-sighted fanatics could have conceived or approved of militancy. Outrages of the militant type, if few, could have no effect upon the everyday life of the nation as a whole; if numerous enough to arrest public attention, they could only render the people of this country more hostile to the movement of which they were the direct outcome. As the event has proved, militant outrages have been numerous enough not only to arrest attention, but also to arouse the widest indignation. They have been per-

THE REPLY

petrated in a manner so inconsequent and so reckless that they have entirely lost any value that might otherwise have been claimed for them as a means to an end. While the connection of the perpetrators with the Woman Suffrage agitation is recognized, the crimes are viewed not in relation to the enfranchisement of women, but as a thing apart—the excesses of a band of misguided people who affect to be the enemies of society. Even now their insane actions, numerous as they are, would evoke only contempt, were it not for their bearing on the reputation of the country for ordered government and common sense. Militancy to-day is not advertising the Woman Suffrage cause in the favourable sense anticipated by Mrs. Fawcett; it is injuring Britons in their own esteem and in the eyes of foreign countries. The suppression of militancy is demanded because the country is becoming a by-word among the nations, and because the cause of law and order is being brought into disrepute.

The difficulties in the way of suppressing militancy are recognized. Never before has crime been so richly endowed. Honour in the little world in which she moves and has her being awaits the perpetrator; if she desire monetary payment as well, she is assured of it; if she be sanctimoniously inclined, bishops and a Church League are there to dole out inspiration and reward in the tribute that they pay to Militants while affecting to regret militancy. The adoption of the hunger strike reduces the ordinary punishment by imprisonment to a farce, and male administrators of the law are reluctant to adopt more drastic measures against the deluded women. Thus in the case of the Militant Suffragists the ordinary deterrents to crime are of no avail, while the incentives are numerous and, to unbalanced minds,

compelling. With a view to depleting the Militants' war chest, the Government now hopes to bring home to individual subscribers of the Women's Social and Political Union legal responsibility for the damage done. That the commission of outrages has only been rendered possible by the large sums of money at the Militants' disposal is obvious, and there is good reason to suppose that many of those who have not hesitated to subscribe in the past would shrink from the infamy of having their complicity in the outrages proclaimed in court. The Government's duty is plain; to leave no stone unturned to cope with the organization which exists for the perpetration of outrages. In due time, no doubt, both militancy and the parent anomaly, the Woman Suffrage agitation, will pass into the limbo of false creeds. All that the movement, as directed by Mrs. Fawcett and Mrs. Pankhurst, has brought about is the concentration for definite action of a certain number of ill-balanced female minds. These potential degenerates have always been with us, but until Mrs. Fawcett preached votes for women no specific outlet was provided for their witlessness or criminal instincts. It is true that among Suffragists are many women who have served well their generation. Any services, however, which they may have rendered to their country have been performed apart from the Suffrage movement. As Suffragists they have done nothing that will leave the world better than they found it. Individually—as Poor Law Guardians, doctors, teachers, inspectors, or what not, in a word, as women—they may have earned the gratitude of the nation. As Suffragists they have given the country nothing but a band of reckless degenerates pledged to arson and sacrilege.

Degrading Motherhood

The "*New Witness*," an English publication, recently published a letter from a feminist who stood sponsor for the following revolting principles:

"Sir:—Surely the true moral of the existing tangle of our marriage laws is not far to seek. Those laws are based on the assumption that children belong to the parents. If a child belongs to any one but itself it is surely to the community of which it forms a part. The cost of producing and rearing children should be borne by the state, which should also enjoy full control. Motherhood, if it is to be justly estimated, must be treated as a public service, and the supply of children be recognized by the state as at least as essential as the supply of water or electricity. With the mother adequately paid for the social function which she performs all practical difficulties relating to the control of children can be dismissed. Parents can make what arrangements they choose with perfect freedom and at no risk to the community.

"Yours faithfully,

"(MRS.) LUCILLE F. LIMMER.

"Sidcup, Kent."

This is orthodox Socialist doctrine. The child does not belong to its parents,

One thing may be set down for certain. When the women vote, no Helen Dewey, press agent, will be permitted to sue any State Senator Helen Ring Robinson of Colorado for a division of the vanished profits of the vanishing lady lecturer. And Mrs. Blatch will surely not be exposed to this inexcusable outrage committed by her landlord just because her Political Equality League hadn't paid the rent for several months.

the state is its legal guardian, motherhood is a social function—all these principles have been advocated by Engels and Bebel. Their recurrence, under feminist guise, is but further evidence of the alliance between the ultra-radical woman's movement and Socialism. How any Christian-minded woman can support a movement that advocates such vicious theories is beyond comprehension.

The family is anterior to the state and possesses rights upon which the latter cannot encroach. By nature, parents have the right and duty to rear their offspring. The state's concern for children is an indirect one and its interference is only warranted where private family activity is inadequate. It is as a member of the family that the child becomes a member of society, for it is the family, and not the individual, that is the unit of society.

Socialism and its allied forces would degrade motherhood to a social function. Propagation of children would be put on a plane with the supplying of a municipality with water. Children would be torn from their parents and reared in municipal barracks. Parental affection and filial devotion would leave the world. Family life would be doomed.—*The Live Issue*.

"A Mere Man," writes THE REPLY that if Mrs. Havelock Ellis or any other suff decided never to kiss her husband until she gets the vote, it will be the greatest tactical blunder of the lady's life in a world where, as this mere man declares, the number of beautiful and really attractive women inclined to be sociable if sufficiently urged is increasing every hour.

Woman Suffrage and the Democratic Party

By Hon. Everett P. Wheeler

Mrs. Harriot Stanton Blatch, in her article in the August number of *National Monthly*, presented in her usual plausible way some reasons why the Democratic party should declare itself for the extension of political suffrage to women. As a Democratic veteran, ready as ever to march in the ranks and fight the battle, let me give a few reasons on the other side.

1. The party is divided on the subject. For example, the President and the Vice-President are both opposed to political suffrage for women. Many other loyal Democrats are on the same side. Would it not be ridiculous for the platform makers to read us out of the party? That is not the way to victory. It is the business of a party to advocate certain great principles on which it is united, leaving the rest as open questions.

2. Mrs. Blatch says there are four million women who are voters and that they will vote against any party that does not favor woman suffrage. Could there be a stronger proof that they are unfit for the ballot? What? Allow a matter of sex preference and sex rule to determine their vote on questions of national policy—the tariff, the currency—monopolies, relations to Mexico, relations to Europe? That is what we who oppose woman suffrage have always said; that if women were admitted to vote on political questions, they would be influenced by personal considerations and not try to find out the merits of the political

questions to be decided by the electorate. And now Mrs. Blatch admits this and warns the men to be afraid of the women voters. The logical result is that we must keep them out of political power. As Labouchere said: "Women do some things much better than men. But the question is, Will they make good electors? In my judgment they will not."

3. Another reason is that the suffragists during the last two years, have done their best to distract the attention of the Democratic party in Congress from the vitally important subjects before them, and bully or tease Congressmen to forsake the pledge of the platform on which they were elected. This platform expressly declares:

"Believing that the most efficient results under our system of government are to be attained by the full exercise by the states of their reserved sovereign powers, we denounce the efforts of our opponents to deprive the states of any of the rights reserved to them."

But the suffragists want Democrats to overrule this traditional plank of the party, and take away from each state the power to determine this question for itself. They have done this at a time when the party was wrestling with most difficult subjects—the tariff, the currency, monopolies, and foreign affairs. No suffragist has made any contribution to the solution of our problems. But they din "Votes for women" in our ears, as if that would aid us to perform the task the country has entrusted to us.—From the *National Monthly*.

The little band of Capital City society suffragists has returned from the sea-shore. They were all very pretty girls.

The Cleveland dancing masters draw the line on all the new Oriental wiggles. Votes for women!

The Reasons of a Connecticut Woman

To the Editor of "The Reply":

You have asked the question "Do you want woman suffrage in the United States?" I sent you the word "No" written on the paper with the question. I wish that I could make that "No" loud and emphatic. I have always disliked publicity myself and for the good women of my family and my friends, but now I am almost ready to speak in opposition. May I tell you some of the reasons why I think we should oppose woman suffrage?

This question of woman suffrage is a political one and is to be found in the Progressive platform "Equal Suffrage for Men and Women." The Socialist platform has "Unrestricted and Equal Suffrage for Men and Women." In the Socialist Labor platform is found this phrase—"in which every worker shall have a voice and vote," and in the Prohibition Party platform is found the following, "Suffrage based on moral and educational fitness and not upon sex." These quotations are taken from Party Platforms published in a New Haven newspaper, the *Journal-Courier*, at the time of the last general election. We must ask ourselves, "Is this woman suffrage movement for higher morals, for higher standards? Is it for the betterment of our social and home life?"

Because woman suffrage is a large part of the Feminist movement.

Because the ideas of the Woman Suffragist, the Feminist and the Socialist are opposed to home and family life and against all that is best and highest in womanhood, I have found nothing ideal, nothing spiritual in the three movements named.

Because we anti-suffragists believe in home and family life, we cannot agree with the Socialist and Feminist that "the family is a worn out institution," or "that it tends to selfishness." Nor can we approve of the "unmarried mother" because it is degrading to be a good and honest wife, mother and housekeeper without pay.

Dean Brown in his informal talk said that the family was the unit of our social life.

Professor William Sumner in "Earth Hunger and Other Essays" says in one of the essays, the monogamic family, the monogamic marriage is the noblest and grandest of monopolies or institutions.

We anti-suffragists believe that woman, married or single, can have a very big place in family and home life, philanthropic and educational movements. The "job" of the married woman and mother is no trifling one with all the interesting problems and responsibilities, first of training and guiding children to be honest, fine, men, women and citizens, and of being a home keeper and a careful economic housekeeper. Problems safely and sanely solved by mothers and housekeepers are, or can be, of help to city and state.

We are sometimes told by woman suffragists that wages will be raised, improved by women's voting. Wages are not affected by legislature and voting, but by honesty, good character, efficiency and skill; also by economic conditions and the law of supply and demand.

Sex antagonism and contempt are more noticeable.

Due very probably to the Woman Suffrage and Feminist movements, lack of

chivalry and politeness, lack of good manners is most noticeable.

Philanthropic associations are not helped by the woman suffragists, for some of the suffragists are decidedly lessening their contributions or not giving at all. Those who are reading and observing at the present day have noticed that Woman Suffragism, Feminism, and Socialism are movements backward and downward, not upward to high ideals and to higher, finer morals and standards.

Sometimes we are told that woman suffrage, votes for women, will bring about certain reforms and benefits, but as we read and observe it looks as though suffragism combined with other "isms"

would bring about certain conditions which social workers and philanthropists

The writer has heard anti-suffragists referred to scornfully or laughingly because we speak of the married woman and mother as being most harmed by voting, but the good woman who has children, home and husband would surely find it an added burden and responsibility. The mother and married woman is doing her duty to society and to state by bearing and rearing children and is the fully developed woman. Therefore let us single women do all we can to save the married women from the burden of the suffrage.

A. H. B.

New Haven, Conn.

The Broad View

By Walt Mason

(Copyright, 1914, by the Adams Newspaper Service)

No doubt the girls deserve the rights for which they clamor days and nights, and men should patient be and fair; I love the women passing well, but when they raise their "rebel yell" I'm glad my granny isn't there. The women ought to have a hand in governing this happy land —they have that right, and more to spare; this cheerfully I grant each maid —but when I see a suff parade I'm glad Aunt Agnes isn't there. The dames who help to bear the yoke should have the right to chew and smoke and play cheap

politics and swear; but when the wives neglect their home and chase around with batty domes, I'm glad my grand-niece isn't there. I'd like to see the women gain all blessings that they would obtain, and all imagined laurels wear; but when I think of politics, with all its cheap and sordid tricks, I'm glad my sister isn't there. Let others' sisters, aunts, and wives go forth and sacrifice their lives, and resolute and paw the air; their sacred cause is all O. K., but I am thankful every day that Cousin Susan isn't there.—*The N. Y. Globe.*

Is There More Drudgery in the Home than in Business?

By Mrs. Christine Frederick

I know and am willing to admit that woman has and has had a great deal of drudgery to do in the home. She has spun flax, made apple butter, baked billions of pies, brought up trillions of babies. I would not be competent to list the different kinds and degrees of drudgery to which women have been subjected through all the ages.

Nevertheless, I believe in a spirit of fairness, and I want to-day to say something about the drudgery of men. You have all heard many women talk as if drudgery was a quality of work confined solely to dish washing, mopping floors and bathing babies.

But I want you to consider a moment if while woman has been occupied with these tasks of drudgery man has not at the same time been taking his share of them? The average woman talks as if all work in the home were drudgery and that all work in shop, factory and office were play. She sees her husband depart in the morning, and in her mind she thinks he partakes in a moving picture of agreeable daily tasks in a standardized office, or shop where conditions are 100 per cent. perfect, while she stays at home incarcerated in a kitchen, doomed to a round of routine labor.

I think this is a totally unfair and biased view. In the first place, every man from boyhood has instilled into him the responsibility of supporting a family, and that responsibility is, in itself, drudgery. Not nearly as many women have instilled into them, from childhood, the responsibility of managing a

home and thinking of assuming the responsibility of efficient home management. While their brothers are learning in business, or factory, they may be only butterflies, or at least not seriously considering training for their future responsibilities.

Again, how many, many men in the ordinary occupations and positions are absolutely slaves to a system, and only cogs in the wheels of big business? Hundreds and hundreds of clerks add up rows of figures from 9 to 6, sitting before one desk in the same monotonous position. How many porters run elevators from 7 A.M. until 10 at night, ceaselessly and continuously stopping from floor to floor without a single outside stimulus or relief? How many men light lamps, or drive garbage wagons, or punch tickets from eight to ten hours daily? How many men, in even higher walks of life, are tied down by routine and discipline to oversee other employees, to superintend, to check up, to handle a thousand dry, uninteresting details, merely because they must do it in order to support a family?

So often women have shown in their talks that they think every man in every job is doing what he really wants to do, that thing which best expresses himself. On the contrary, statistics show that nine-tenths of the men in all positions are there not because they want to be, or because they are particularly fitted for it, but simply and solely because they are doomed to be and stay where they are in order to earn enough money to live.

So I feel that this attitude about work which many women, especially married women, have, is entirely unfair. I think, frankly, that it is only an excuse to escape from responsibility; because they do not like to do something, they call it drudgery and refuse to undertake it.

What would happen if all the men who

hated their jobs refused to do their work? The solution will be to develop more intelligence, in both sexes, so that drudgery in both men's work and women's work will be eliminated as much as possible.—(Copyright, 1914, by Mrs. Christine Frederick.)—*The Sun*, May 1st, 1914.

Some Suffragists "Wet"

Even Affiliate with Liquor Interests, Says Miss Price

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, June 21.—Miss Lucy J. Price, a prominent campaign speaker against woman suffrage, today issued a statement charging not only that equal suffrage did not effect an increase in "dry" territory, but that in some States, at least, there was an alliance between the female suffragists and the whisky interests. Miss Price cites the fact that Mrs. M. S. Bonnifield and Mrs. S. G. Lamb, President and Secretary, respectively, of the Woman's Equal Franchise Society of Winnemucca, Nev., signed and had published in a newspaper in that town "the following amazingly frank reading notice":

To Whom It May Concern—The impression is prevalent among a number in this community that the members of the Woman's Equal Franchise Society are fighting the liquor interests. We have no quar-

rel with the existing order of things, saloons or otherwise. We are simply asking for the right to vote, because we think it but justice to have a hand in the Government we help to support. If we secure this privilege, we are bound by no promise and will exercise our right according to individual conscience. Some of the men interested in the saloon business here have shown us not only the greatest courtesy, but have helped us in various ways.

"If the persons who circulate stories to the contrary will look up the history of States that have given women the ballot," said Miss Pirce, "we think they will find they are not any 'drier' than they were before. Utah and Colorado, where women have voted for years, are not prohibition States. San Francisco voted on the liquor question last year after women were admitted to the polls and went wet by a large majority."

It is fair to ask how it is that these Chicago reporters know that the eight women "cops" just put to work in the Western metropolis wear blue stockings.

The militant suffs of England promise to slash no more of the old masters until this cruel war is over. Nevertheless, the police are watching them.

How the People Decide

Published by the Massachusetts Association, Boston

One of the cleverest things the suffragists are doing at present is to try to hypnotize the public into thinking that suffrage is "bound to come." The Rev. Anna Shaw says "it is practically won." This statement undoubtedly influences certain uninformed people, as it is intended to do—but what are the facts on which it is based? There are nine states which have equal suffrage, and the entire population of the nine falls 1,382,065 below that of the state of New York! Wyoming, which is 1½ times as large as all New England, has a population about the size of Cambridge. Utah has a population of four to the square mile. The whole nine states have a population something over seven million. Why should the great states of the Union follow the vagaries of these sparsely settled communities? Populism, free silver, and Mormonism have all had a strong following in these same states, but the east was too sane to adopt them. The suffragists declare that it is a great victory for their cause that various state legislatures have voted to refer the question of suffrage to

the people. But the result of such "victories" in Ohio, Wisconsin and Michigan was so disastrous that they did not dare risk one in Illinois. In Ohio the majority against them was 86,000, in Wisconsin 91,000, in Michigan 96,000! Therefore in Illinois the suffragists preferred to work by means of a secret lobby for partial suffrage, which the legislature could grant, rather than allow the people to vote on a suffrage amendment. In Massachusetts in 1895 when the men voted on a suffrage referendum the majority against it was 100,000! Do these figures denote that it means "victory" for the suffrage cause to have it referred to the people? They do not, and the suffragists know it, and are working hard for an amendment to the National constitution in order that they need not refer it to the people at all! Everywhere they bitterly oppose referring the question of suffrage to the women, and they would like if possible to avoid giving men a chance to vote on it—and yet they pretend that their movement is a "democratic" one!

Mrs. J. H. Buck, Hartford, Conn.

It is an odd thing that what Ida Tarbell calls the most effective argument for female suffrage, namely, that votes for women will improve their economic and industrial status, should have less merit in it than almost any other.

Madam Schumann-Heink and the co-respondent in the case have not yet toed the scratch in a 14-foot ring; but they are both strong for the rights of women, and the mill may be expected to come off at any time.

If They Want Suffrage

(*The Catholic Transcript*)

There are too many easy-going people in the world who stand ready to make almost any concession because someone demands it. At the outbreak of the Civil War there were people in the North who said of the seceding states, "If they want to go let them; wayward sisters, depart in peace!" Had this advice been followed there would have been no United States to-day. There is before the country now a proposed change that would go as certainly to the foundation of our institutions and would affect the social order even more profoundly than did secession! This change is female suffrage, and yet there are many men who say, "If the women want it, let them have it." This is a shallow and inadequate view to take of so far-reaching and disruptive a change. Such questions should be dealt with, not on the basis of what a number of men or women want or think they want, but with regard to what is wise and best for the community as a whole. Everyone, before committing themselves to the suffrage cause, ought to consider carefully and candidly the possible results of abandoning all the theories upon which our social structure has rested in its relation to the sexes. It must be remembered that hitherto the social and political unit has been the family and not the individual, that the man was by nature adapted to be its protector and breadwinner and the woman its domestic guardian, and all her care, thought and energy are required to carry forward the race and to meet the duties and requirements incidental to her exacting and fundamental task. To her is committed the bearing, nurture and training of the children on which more than anything else our future depends. There can be no

question of superiority or inferiority as between the two. They complement each other and make up one whole, into which it would be disastrous to inject the idea of distrust and of antagonistic sexes. Are the women who are seeking to secure suffrage and to enter public life, which must necessarily follow, with all its wrangling and bitterness, are these women performing their undeniable duties so well that they must needs force their way into the sphere hitherto reserved for men and take up their tasks? Is there nothing to be desired in making the home a better, happier place, in improving the standards of character and education and physical well-being for children, in learning domestic economy and in directing all the numerous social and charitable agencies for the uplift of mankind for which women are so peculiarly fitted? There is a great work to be performed in bringing about a better adjustment of domestic service. From its ranks, far more than any other, the social evil is recruited. Should women, with so plain a duty neglected, turn to work for which they are not fitted? In government calm reason is needed above all things. Too many women are ruled by emotion and sentiment, and the suffragists of England, who belong to the educated classes, have demonstrated, by their hysterical, criminal actions in seeking the ballot, that they are unfit to use it. If women were in legislatures what reason is there to suppose they would not resort to the same sort of tactics to force through measures which they had set their hearts on? It is unworthy of any intelligent person to consent to female suffrage solely because some women want and clamor for it. And is it not unjust to force it on a large majority who do not want it?

Socialism Proposes the Confiscation of Private Property

There is no longer any doubt that the program of Socialism means the confiscation of private property.

The leading socialists of the nation and of the world admit this. In this nation at the present time there is about \$80,000,000,000 of property that would come under the act of confiscation. This includes all the farms, all the business blocks and the houses that are rented, the railways, telegraphs, banks, machinery, telephones and all manufacturing industry.

The logical socialists know very well that a socialist political victory would result in a "take over" of this vast wealth and they know equally well that they would have no means to pay for such property; moreover, the socialists claim that the capitalists have been robbing the working class for generations and that it is nothing more than "restitution" to take from the present owners their property. Socialists also propose to repudiate all National, State, County and municipal debts.

It is well therefore, for property owners to realize just what a victory for Socialism means. At the present time the Socialist Party, alone, is spending more than a million dollars a year; it has nearly 100 paid agitators, speakers and organizers; it has about 30 publica-

tions of which some 35 are daily newspapers and one of their daily newspapers has 170,000 circulation every day; one weekly has more than 500,000 circulation. With the vast propaganda of Socialism and its alliance with woman suffragism, is it not time that thoughtful men and women realized the growing danger and prepared to meet it? Will not woman suffragism naturally increase this danger by more than 100 per cent? Will not woman with her lack of philosophy, naturally join the socialist camp with its appeal of a "heaven on earth" existence for everybody? There can be no doubt whatever that with woman suffrage there would be several Socialist congressmen, many members of the state legislatures and other officials very soon. The socialist propaganda, like that of suffragism, is based upon a misrepresentation of facts and a false philosophy. But the people must be made acquainted with this fact. It is therefore the duty of every patriotic citizen to aid in the gigantic task of preserving our economic and political liberty. We must circulate anti-socialist and anti-suffragist literature. If you are willing to aid this, your cause, we shall be glad to show you how effective and successful methods may be applied.

The Cincinnati suffragists are still of opinion that they want no Father's Day; Dad has too soft a thing of it already.

"The harem veil made its appearance Saturday at Piping Rock. Votes for women!"—*N. Y. World*.

The English Woman Grievance

Annie Riley Hale

In view of the opinion frequently expressed in this country, that the English women have political and legislative grievances of which Americans can not complain; and the tendency to view leniently even the militant outrages, because of this ignorance of English laws, we quote the following from Prof. Albert V. Dicey, King's Counsel, and Vinerian professor of English Law in the University of Oxford:

"The Married Woman's Property Acts of 1870 to 1892, practically completed in 1882, together with the Guardianship of Infants Acts of 1886, have removed almost every grievance of which a married woman, in respect of her property, had reason to complain. So that the question which an English reformer need now ask himself is, whether the zeal to relieve a woman from unjust liabilities, may not, as against her creditors, have bestowed upon her unfair privileges." He says further: "We know in 1909, what down to 1882 might have been open to question, that from a Parliament of men, elected by men, women can obtain,

because in fact they have obtained, relief from every proved wrong. . . . Women in modern England exert through free discussion, and the certainty with which it tells on public opinion, a legislative influence which indefinitely diminishes, if it does not absolutely annihilate, the force of the argument that the women of England need Parliamentary representation as a guarantee against probable oppression."

Add to this the fact that English women have the municipal franchise, that they are Town Councillors, and there is one woman Mayor, and it is evident that English oppression of women has been much exaggerated, and that the militant excesses are the acts of spoiled children, rather than the exasperated violence of down-trodden sufferers.

It is further significant that Prof. Dicey, from whose "Letters To a Friend, On Votes For Women," the above quotations are cited, was originally in favor of woman suffrage, and had been most active in promoting better educational facilities for women.

Women Fail to Register

Kansas Phenomenon Puzzles Politicians, Who Seek the Reason

(*Special to The New York Times*)

Topeka, Kan., July 12.—Politicians of all parties in Kansas are worried over the refusal of women to register, so they may vote at the State-wide primary election to be held on Aug. 4. In all the cities and towns of the first and second class in the State voters must register before they can participate in the pri-

mary. More than 300,000 women have the right to vote, and probably 125,000 of these live in the cities and towns.

The columns of party newspapers in many cities are filled with pleas asking women to register before July 20. The indifference of the women is worrying the party leaders. They do not know what to make of the matter.

The Woman that Will Survive

[From "A Message to American Mothers," Written for the Delineator
by Dr. Charles W. Eliot]

The diminishing size of families in the civilized portions of the white race and the frequency of childlessness in married pairs prove, beyond question, that large numbers of women are missing their most important and their happiest occupation.

No gains in other directions can possibly compensate women for this loss; for the work of bearing and rearing children and making a home for a family gives a woman her best chance of physical well-being and of sound intellectual and spiritual development.

No accessibility for women to the callings or professions which until recently have been open only to men can compensate women for the loss or stunting of their opportunity for rendering loving and devoted service.

No economic gains for women, no better access to the social excitements and so-called pleasures which city life affords, can possibly compensate young women for any impairment of their chances to win the natural joys of normal family life.

No social or political service can bring women opportunity to contribute to the real progress and development of mankind comparable with that of the healthy wife and mother who bears and brings up from four to eight children.

Any active-minded mother who follows the mental development of five or

six children will receive herself a second schooling greatly superior to her first. It is a lively mental exercise to keep in touch with the successively developed interests of a group of children from two to twenty years of age.

What, then, is the reasonable view concerning the entrance of young women into all sorts of occupations that used to be reserved for men, such as school-teaching, service as clerks, cashiers or secretaries, and as saleswomen in shops, operatives in mills, or operators in telegraph offices or telephone exchanges?

These are all good occupations for young women, provided they do not impair health or prevent or unduly postpone marriage.

When the period of child-bearing is over, or a young wife has been widowed, democratic society welcomes women to many interesting and useful occupations which afford women of intelligence and good-will excellent outlets for the energies of their later years. The best school, however, for these later activities is normal family life from twenty to fifty or thereabouts.

The ultimate woman is, then, the vigorous, nursing, teaching mother of a family, whose motherhood grows more and more comprehensive as life goes on, and finally comes to embrace four generations of kindred and friends, and all cast-down and unhappy people.

New Haven's "Parade" a Frost in June

To the Editor of "The Reply":

Suffrage Day has come and gone in New Haven, and aside from the few, who, presumably the next day might be affected with sore throat, it would hardly be a matter of thought twenty-four hours later. Certainly there was little to impress one's memory long. It was an ideal day in June, but to the suffragette one might suppose it would have felt as frosty as a morning in November. A band concert will always bring out the people, but in spite of this largely advertised attraction, and contrary to newspaper reports, the number on the green was much smaller than on other occasions when a band has been advertised to play. Those who had nothing else to do and were in a mood to be mildly entertained, strolled out to hear the music and take a look at the supporters of the "wild women" in England.

Eight automobiles, trimmed with tissue paper, circulated around the blocks of the principal streets, much after the manner of a half dozen supes, hired at a theatre to represent a regiment. Some pedestals, named after suffrage States, the whole population of which does not equal that of New York, were placed in spots on the green. Occasionally somebody in the distance would blow a bugle, at the sound of which a woman would mount a pedestal and begin to wail. Little girls of nine or ten endeavoring to sell suffrage buttons paraded the side-

walks accosting the men, thereby receiving their first lesson in earning a livelihood from the street. Young women of eighteen or twenty were deemed more profitable as salesladies in the students quarters. On Chapel Street one woman would have done credit to an African dodger, so expert was she, not in dodging away from, but in front of, the men.

Suffragettes were requested to float their colors from the house tops. If the few flags I saw were indicative of the number of suffragettes New Haven is unfortunate enough to possess, the indication does not tally with suffragette accountings of their increase in numbers, and in attending a "Woman Suffrage Mutual Admiration Society Meeting" one is some times disposed to wonder a little at the suddenness with which some of the papers receive their signatures.

Albeit the great Suffrage Day" came and went, and though the majority of people went about their business, with scarcely a look at the suffragettes actively engaged in bustling around the green, a few came (some in baby carriages) looked and listened, and I have no doubt some of the "suffs" had a very happy day, for

Every little pedestal
Had a gathering all its own,
And on every little pedestal
A suffragette was shown.

EMMA LOUISE STREET.
New Haven, June 8, 1914.

"You don't dare to say," writes a subscriber, "that Mrs. Catt of Kansas is easily the acknowledged super-dreadnaught of the female suffrage movement."

It seems that the Mrs. Havelock Ellis brand of suffragist is giving up the idea, "No votes, no kisses." Market glutted, probably.

The Woman's Journal as a Joke

The following from the *Woman's Journal* of June 20 issue calls for a few remarks:

"The members of the women's clubs are, for the most part, used to accomplishing what they set out to do. Many of them are good parliamentarians. I venture to predict that, if they set out to have the working women of the United States relieved from work in mills, factories, shops and stores between nine in the evening and five in the morning, they will be successful, and that no amount of declaring a bill 'unconstitutional' will daunt them. Because they are women and have a sympathetic knowledge of what day labor means to a woman, they will be the first to voice their indignation that a girl or woman may by law be so at the mercy of a greedy, brutal employer that her night's rest may be infringed upon.

"They will be indignant, and their indignation will be turned to action. They have accomplished much already through civics and legislation, and many of them have learned how necessary it is to have the backing of the vote if they want to be sure of accomplishing their just wishes. In the current number of 'The Reply,' an anti-suffrage periodical, F. G. R. Gordon asks: 'What law or policy do the wage-earning women expect to get through the ballot that they cannot get with much less effort without it?'

"We should cry 'Shame' upon the anti-suffragists who take this position. If it is easy to accomplish legislation and enforcement of the law without the ballot, they ought to make it their business, as anti-suffragists, to change these laws regarding the hours for working

women. In the great majority of our states they have not done it, and since they have not tried the ballot as a means, they ought to be willing to try that, or at least not to hinder others from trying it. The time has come for the anti-suffragists to go out of business."

Signed AGNES E. RYAN.

In the first place I wonder why it is that the dear, delightful suffragists of Colorado allow any female to work after nine o'clock at night and before five in the morning? And when are the suffragists in California going to turn the state upside down in this matter of child and woman labor? The ladies of California just now are most active in perfecting an organization to defeat prohibition, and I bid them God speed, because prohibition is a farce and a fraud wherever tried in an industrial state. Whether the anti-suffragists have or have not been active in passing child and woman labor laws, the fact is that man *has been* active along this line and ninety-nine out of every one hundred laws passed shortening the hours of labor have been laws for women and children—not for men. And every industrial state has some of those laws upon the statute books already.

Now, as a matter of fact, the wage working women are not asking anyone to make any change in the hours of labor. Indeed, the trouble has been that every time we men have sought to shorten the hours of labor for the working women, they have opposed it. When we were engaged in a mighty struggle to place the first ten hour law upon the statute books of New Hampshire, we met with great opposition from the wage earning wom-

THE REPLY

en. They signed long petitions asking that the bill be defeated. But we men kept right on with the fight and won. When a majority of the women stand up and demand an eight hour work day they will get it, vote or no vote, and no one knows this better than the petticoat politicians of the suffrage army.

One would think after reading two copies of the *Woman's Journal* that no one had any right to think for themselves in this free land,—unless they happened to think the way the suffragists want them to. And this is the kind of liberty that the suffragists want. They want liberty to rule or ruin the politics of the nation. Of course they won't be able to do any ruling, even if woman suffrage wins, because a majority of the women would never vote with the suffragists anyhow. Ninety-nine women out of every one hundred who run for office will be cut by their sisters.

Miss Ryan is asking us to try the voting for women scheme for reform

laws for working women. Why, bless you, haven't we seen the "votes for women" tried out in ten states without any benefit to anybody? Haven't we seen the women voting for labor-socialism in Australia and voting for the 24 hour day saloon for many years? Haven't we seen the woman suffragist organization of Italy vote unanimously to join the socialist-anarchist movement of Italy? I say socialist-anarchist movement, because those two wings of the red flag revolution work together in that country.

And having seen all this and more, can there be any logical reason why we should go out of business? Would it not be more sane and sensible to ask the suffragists what they are in business for anyway? The time has come for the suffragists to join the socialists for Socialism is their best friend and strongest supporter.

F. G. R. GORDON.

Fielder Not a Suffragist

Tells Woman's Political Union He Is Not in Sympathy with the Movement

In declining an invitation to speak at a suffrage meeting to be held recently in Newark under the auspices of the Women's Political Union, Gov. Fielder wrote to Mrs. Mina C. Van Winkle, President of the Political Union, that he was not interested in the suffrage movement. This is the Governor's letter:

Mr. Dear Mrs. Van Winkle: Replying to your letter of yesterday, I beg to be permitted to decline your invitation to attend the meeting of

the Women's Political Union on July 5. Sundays are really the only days I am not engaged in official and business duties, and I am endeavoring to keep them free for much-needed rest; but there is still a further reason, that I am not, as you know, in sympathy with your suffrage movement and could therefore not be interested in your meeting. Very truly yours,

JAMES F. FIELDER.

FEMINISM IN AMERICA

(*From the London Times*)

But the agitation for the vote is only a part, and nowadays not the most important part, of the feminist movement in the United States. It is rather curious that the two countries where feminism has been most venturesome in talk and on paper are Germany, where women have been perhaps excessively repressed, and America, where they have been perhaps excessively indulged. Certainly in the United States all the aspects of the relationship of the sexes are today being canvassed with a diligence and freedom that twenty years ago would have been incredible and fifty years ago impossible.

Hundreds of shrill, ecstatic voices and clever pens are drumming it into man that he has made a mess of government, society, morals, marriage, industry and everything else, and that it is time for him to prepare for a process analogous to spring cleaning in all departments of public and private life. His institutions and ideas, his domestic arrangements and assumptions, his "double standard of morality" and his industrial practices are all being shrewdly assailed; and the harmless American man now finds himself denounced as the foe to women's economic independence, the censor of their morals, the repressor of their claims to political and civic equality, and the enslaver of their individualities.

Feminism, in short, is raking him fore and aft. It is all highly stimulating and earnest and not a little diverting; and it seems not unlikely to make the United States the forcing-bed of a more abundant crop of social panaceas than the world has been privileged to witness since the French Revolution.

WHY NOT IN THE HOME?

Discussing before the Federation of Women's Clubs the experiment in Chicago of teaching sex hygiene in the schools, Mrs. Ella Flagg Young, Superintendent of Education, said they preferred to call it "personal hygiene," and then went on to add "I was reluctant to undertake the responsibility. I went to Dean Sumner and told him it was the duty of the church. He declared it was the duty of the public schools. We argued it long and often, but finally \$10,000 was appropriated by the city to get the lecturers and I had to do it."

Among the interesting features of this bit of Chicago school history, not the least notable is the fact that it appears to have occurred neither to Mrs. Young nor to Dean Sumner nor to the city fathers that the subject might be taught best and most effectively in the home. Why should church and school assume to divide between them sole supervision and responsibility for all forms of education and of conduct?

The incident in itself is a small one, but it shows the increasing tendency on the part of outside authorities to eliminate parents from all charge in the teaching and training of their children. It is of course euphonious to say "personal hygiene" rather than to use an objectionable word, but the fact remains unchanged; and just why there should be public teaching of what cannot be publicly named is not apparent to those who believe that the home is still an American institution and that fathers and mothers have a duty to teach something to their own children.—*N. Y. World*.

The Sun Dial

(*Evening Sun*)

Looking Into the Future

The Emporia (Kan.) *Gazette* objects to having "the baby names of women" who are running for office printed on the ballots—Elizabeth and Mary should appear, it contends, instead of Lizzie and Mamie.

We think the *Gazette* is quite wrong. A softer, sweeter, gentler, tenderer, more motherly, more sisterly sort of national life is the object of female suffrage, and as a symbol of it the cooing diminutive is quite appropriate. We should be consistent about these things.

In the political fights of the future, when women rule, we will no longer see in the papers such crude and brutal headline as:

JONES CALLS BROWN MALICIOUS LIAR

There will be disagreements, of course—politics is one disagreement after another—but the sense of them will be conveyed in a softer and sweeter fashion.

Headlines will read:

GOV. TESSIE CALLS SENATOR BESSIE A MEAN THING.

BOSS PINKIE A CAT, MURMURS PRESIDENT SUSIE.

It would be better yet—it would be a more complete reform—it would be more

sweetly symbolical of the complete feminization of America—if the dear little homelike nicknames of the women politicians were put on the tickets, used in the newspapers and signed to official papers. The maternal instinct is behind the modern woman's desire to take control of our national life; we distrust the sincerity of the maternal instinct unless it expresses itself in baby talk. We expect to live to see headlines like the following:

TOODLE-OODLES-OO ISSUES HER THANKSGIVING PROCLAMATION.

TESSIE-WESSIE-BESTEST-EST PARDONS MURDERER.

LOVEY-DOVEY-GOVERNOR A CANDIDATE FOR SENATOR.

When our national life finally takes on this tone the country will be like a nursery. Bad women, of course, there are; but we never have noticed that any of them get away with it for very long; the good women can be depended on to attend to that; it is the domestic type that will triumph, reform everything that looks as if it needed it, and rule. The bauble of government, which little boys have not known how to play with nicely or wisely or kindly, will be taken from their hands and put on a high, high shelf.

Unmade History

At the President's first call for troops, militants took the field with ardor. All they asked was to be shown the enemy.

But the casualties of the ensuing campaign were appalling. The resources of the Red Cross were pitifully inadequate. At times half the combatants were seriously if not mortally freckled.

Inevitably spirits drooped. A pickle and a banana were added to the daily ration, but the response was not commensurate with the expense.

"What shall it profit a woman to prove that she can fight as well as a man and lose her complexion?" soldiers were heard to ask one another ominously.—Ex.

The International Movement

As part of the annual report of the National League Opposed to Woman Suffrage of Great Britain, which was organized, some three and a half years ago by the amalgamation of the Woman's National Anti-Suffrage League with the Men's League for Opposing Woman Suffrage, we quote the following from the Anti-Suffrage Review. It is interesting as showing how deeply seated is the opposition to Woman Suffrage the world over:

An encouraging feature of the year is the growth of Anti-Suffrage organizations in other countries and in British Dominions overseas. In Germany there are "The Christian National League for Opposition to Woman Suffrage" and "The German League for Opposing the Enfranchisement of Woman."

From India we have news of the formation of an "All India League" in affiliation with our own Society. Canada sends us accounts of a similar association in Toronto, while the American Associations Opposed to Woman Suff-

rage not only keep us supplied with news through their various excellent publications, *The Women's Protest*, *THE REPLY*, and *The Remonstrance*, but have honored us with a visit from a prominent member, Mrs. George, of Massachusetts, who, at a reception kindly given by Lady Haversham in April last, delivered an illuminating address upon the growing opposition to Woman Suffrage in America, and the failure of the enfranchised women in the Suffrage States to fulfil the sanguine prophecies of Suffragist agitators. We would recommend our members to take in one or more of the American magazines above mentioned, and study the actual experiences of American women. Opinions may be well or ill founded, but facts enable us to judge for ourselves. Our opponents are fond of quoting the number of Suffrage States in America, but they seldom care to mention that during 1913 and the early part of 1914 sixteen States rejected the proposal to enfranchise their women.

Every I. W. W. a Socialist

In the New York "*Call*," May 14, 1911, the following was published:

"There is in this country a labor union that is greatly different from the American Federation of Labor, and this union is growing very rapidly in all sections of the country, particularly in those parts of the country where the industrial system is most highly organized. The name of this union is the Industrial Workers of the World. It is an industrial union

and not a trade union. Besides being organized on an entirely different plan from the American Federation of Labor, it is revolutionary and extremely Socialistic.

"*Every Industrial Worker of the World is a Socialist. The picture of Marx hangs in all their halls; they are all acquainted with the teachings of Marx.*"

Keep Out the Disrupters.

Their Reasons for Opposing Suffrage

HON. THOMAS F. BAYARD.
 "There never was a greater mistake, there never was a falser fact stated than that the women of America need any protection further than the love borne to them by their fellow-countrymen. Do not imperil the advantages which they have; do not attempt in this hasty, ill-considered, shallow way to interfere with the relations which are founded upon the laws of Nature herself."

DR. S. WEIR MITCHELL. "The best of the higher evolution of mind will never be safely reached until the woman accepts the irrevocable decree which made her woman and not man. Something in between she cannot be."

REV. HORACE BUSHNELL, D.D.
 "Hitherto it has been an advantage to be going into battle in our suffrages with a full half . . . as a corps of reserve, left behind, so that we may fall back on this quiet element . . . and settle again our

mental and moral equilibrium. Now it is proposed that we have no reserve any longer, that we go into our conflicts taking our women with us, all to be kept heating in the same fire for weeks or months together. . . . Let no man imagine . . . that our women are going into these encounters to be just as quiet, or as little moved as now, when they stay in the rear unexcited, letting us come back to them often and recover our reason. They are no more mitigators now, but instigators rather, sweltering in the same fierce heats and emotions, only more tempestuously stirred than we."

RICHARD H. DANA. "The truth is, the ballot for women is not needed . . . and if they were ever called upon to combine and work in antagonism to the men, which they must do if their vote is really needed, the evils of the conflict would strike at the very foundations of our social system."

FROM THE TIMES

While a militant suffragist was busy wielding a butcher's cleaver on Sargent's splendid portrait of Henry James in the galleries of the British Royal Academy, Mayor Mitchel was remarking in New York with a sigh:

The progress of suffrage seems to be accompanied with a sacrifice of that which we have prized highly—the courtesy of women.

Mary poisoned Grammy's tea:
 Grammy died in agonie.
 Papa was extremely vexed,
 And said to Mary, "Now, what next?"

HER BALLOT

"Well, my love," said Mr. Dubbkins, after her return from the polls, "did you get your vote at last?"

"Yes," said Mrs. Dubbkins, with a happy smile. "There it is!"

She threw the ballot upon the desk.

"Why," said Mr. Dubbkins, "didn't you cast it?"

"Cast it?" retorted Mrs. Dubbkins. "Cast it? You don't suppose for a moment that now that I've got it I'm going to let go of it, do you? Not if I know myself—I'm going to have it framed."

—Harper's Weekly.

FEMINISM:

By Edith Harman Brown

Feminism develops a Centaur-like creature, with head and heart unalterably woman, and feet ambitious to walk the paths hitherto trod exclusively by man.

Feminism is a state common to the woman with a grudge against some particular man, and voices her cedemnation of the entire masculine sex.

Feminism believes that the Hand that would rule the World must first consign the Cradle to the attic. Feminism apparently envies the hen whose offspring can be hatched, fed, and reared, by that most accommodating of mothers, the Incubator. The Feminists' nearest approach to imitation of the method of her feathered sister is the proposal to build an institution where babies may be kept in the basement, in the care of a general attendant, while the natural (?) mother pursues her outside avocations untrammelled.

Feminism no longer recognizes the phrase, "*Cock of the Walk*," for she would dispense with man altogether, so she says. But should he once take her at her word, and diasappear, how quickly she would be after him!

Feminism rushes in where demons fear to tread, and even the church cannot exorcise her rampant spirit.

F. stands for Feminism. So it does for Free Love, Frenzy and Fanaticism.

Since everybody works but father, it was rather natural that certain New York City suffragists should propose

HENRY AGAINST SUFFRAGE

Chairman of House Rules Committee Also Opposes Prohibition

Washington, Aug. 30.—"I shall resolutely oppose all propositions looking to national prohibition and woman suffrage," declared a statement issued today by Representative Robert L. Henry, Chairman of the House Rules Committee, before which the fight on each of these measures is pending. "It is not possible to draw any amendments providing national prohibition that I am willing to support."

Representative Henry's statement was issued in connection with a letter to Dr. J. H. Bambril of Dallas, head of the Texas Anti-Saloon League, who asked Mr. Henry to review the pending amendments and decide whether a proposal for national prohibition could be so framed as to win his support. In his letter, Mr. Henry points out that with the passage of the Webb bill the question of shipment of liquor into prohibition territory was remanded to the jurisdiction of the several States.

"We are now asked," the letter adds, "to reverse our course and surrender the police powers of the sovereign States to absolute Federal control."

With four of the eleven members of the Rules Committee opposed to a constitutional amendment for woman suffrage, two others probably against it, and four in favor, it is regarded as improbable that the matter will be brought up during the present or December sessions of Congress.

legislation compelling The Old Man to labor instead of legislation providing mothers' pensions.

Mrs. Brown's Dread of Mildew

(*The Evening Sun*)

Mrs. James J. Brown of Denver is said to be thinking of running for United States Senator against Senator Charles Spalding Thomas, whose term will expire next year. We do not gather that Mrs. Brown feels any personal or political resentment against Senator Thomas; she is merely unquiet, restless, needs occupation and feels that the Colorado Senatorship might as well come to her as to anybody else. She has no particular doubts as to her capacity for the work. "I have brought up four families, my own and three others," she is reported as saying. "I have no card sense and I don't care for novels. Why should I be expected to mildew?"

Why, indeed? And why shouldn't she be a United States Senator and inaugurate a system for keeping rust and mildew out of that august chamber? Mrs. Brown is reported to have told an interviewer that she had not decided whether she would run, although obtaining the nomination would give her the election. She is still revolving the question in her mighty mind and doubtless will be governed by her own "best judgment," which we esteem to be an intellectual process so mighty that it ought to carry

her to the Senate or the Supreme Court bench or the Presidency, or any post her fancy paints attractive.

Apparently Mrs. Brown is not one of the timid, feeble souls who are blown about by the wind of anybody else's doctrine. She will not care if Dr. Anna Shaw says it is five years too soon for any woman to run for Congress and it would be treason for any woman to run against Senator Thomas, who has shown himself favorable to the woman suffrage amendment. Dr. Shaw adds that "putting a woman forward to defeat Senator Thomas merely because he is a Democrat shows just about the degree of political sagacity that I should expect of the Congressional Union; they have the greatest lack of that quality of any group of women I ever heard of." But Dr. Shaw seems to forget that Mrs. Brown feels that her own intellectuals are threatened with blight and mildew at the moment. Is her own great personality to be sacrificed to the hidebound prejudices of an old fashioned politician, even if that politician be a woman?

At this stage of our great national progress Mrs. Brown must and shall be preserved; she shall never be allowed to mildew—never, never, never!

It is quite evident that Alcon Hirsch, "the efficiency engineer of the feminist movement," who declares that the feminist husband shall hereafter do the work, is no true friend of The Old Man.

Thus far only the same old Bill Sulzer among the candidates for Governor of New York seems to have committed himself unreservedly to the feminist movement.

For Mothers on the Jury

(*New York Telegraph*)

O, Mary, call the children home and
make the shutters fast,
Put out the cat and fill the furnace full
enough to last;
The key beneath the doormat place, turn
out the front hall light,
For mother's on the jury, and won't be
home to-night.

There was a time, long years ago, when
mother stayed at home,
And tended to her household tasks, with
no desire to roam;
She made the beds and swept the hearth
and kept the children down,
Until one day a Woman's Club was
started in our town.

Soon mother was a member, and all her
leisure time
Was spent in writing papers on "The
Decadence of Rhyme,"
"The Celtic Note in Bernard Shaw," of
"Tennyson—the Man."
But even then she got home ere the even-
ing meal began.

Then came the bridge whist era, when
mother played all day,
Topped off with tea and sandwiches, and
bore the prize away;
Of all the village card sharks our mother
was the best,
But even then she reached home ere the
sun had gone to rest.

From bridge to Civic Betterment the
ladies next did leap,
And mother muttered health laws and
statistics in her sleep;
For lectures and fresh air funds she let
herself be bled,
But she got home from committees ere
the family went to bed.

Now mother has the ballot and at last
has found her niche
In tuning up the Commonwealth to just
the proper niche;
Against corruption, greed and graft the
women have to fight,
So mother's on the jury and she won't
be home to-night.

The Cry of the Woman

By Elizabeth Graeme Barbour

Man's work is mine, tho' woman born;
My hurried way in crowded mart
Is trod unswervingly each morn;
I live a thing apart,
I bear a hungry heart.

Man's love and babe's, life hath denied;
No leisure e'en to give a crust
Is mine, swept onward with the tide

Of those enslaved by lust
Of gold, or load unjust.

I would not vie with men for gain,
Nor in the sun of ease would bask;
I—who man's burden bear with pain—
I want my woman's task.
Give this, O Lord, I ask!

Ex.

Work for the Women of Colorado

THE WOMAN'S PROTECTIVE LEAGUE,
*Object—To Secure the Legal Protection
 of Girl Children.*

Headquarters, 524 Majestic Bldg.,
 Denver Colo.

Denver Colo., June 9, 1914.

Editor "The Reply,"

Some months ago The Woman's Protective League called attention to the unlawful practice of the Denver Juvenile Court in virtually protecting men confessing or convicted of crimes against girl children.

These statements were supported by verified transcripts of the official records of the Juvenile Court itself.

But so shameful was the state of affairs disclosed that Denver and the rest of the country found it hard to believe, especially since Judge Lindsey has long trained the public to believe in his

devotion to children and that any one who criticises the Juvenile Court does so from some selfish or sinister motive.

The disclosures of the Women's Protective League, however, raised doubts and set people to thinking and investigating—something they never did before.

This, together with his recent shockingly false statements in the East about strike conditions in Colorado, have at last aroused our people to his real character and that of his Juvenile Court.

The Woman's Protective League, therefore, desires to call your attention again to its charges and its efforts to expose this man begun about a year ago, and to predict his speedy elimination from the public life of Colorado.

Very respectfully,

DR. MARY ELIZABETH BATES,
Secretary.

By Direction of the Committee.

Awakening of the Antis

To the Editor of the Evening Sun:

Sir.—The tables are turned. "We win" is the slogan of the anti-suffragists. Well may they say so. New York State is riddled with anti-suffrage meetings. They tell me of three famous meetings recently held. Mrs. Grace Duffield Goodwin addressed an overflow meeting of the seniors and the faculty in the chapel of St. Lawrence University, Canton, N. Y. Cheer upon cheer greeted her at the close, only ceasing when she rose to respond. In Ogdensburg the Board of Education adjourned a session to hear her speak at the business men's ban-

quet in the evening and nearly precipitated a row with the suffragists.

Historical Society Hall, Schenectady, was taxed to overflowing when Mrs. A. J. George rose to receive an ovation on her return from abroad. She insists "that the great need of the country is for an intelligent motherhood."

Praise be that the awakening of the apathy of the women on this subject has arrived. I greatly fear me that if the long sleep continued the antis might not be on hand when the suffragists got tired of being "too ladylike."

FLORA MACDONALD.

New York, June 4.

Successes of the Man-Suffrage Association

The Man-Suffrage Association was organized in April, 1913, in New York City, at a meeting of men opposed to the extension of political suffrage to women. At this meeting there were present the following well-known New Yorkers: Messrs. Frank L. Babbott, Ernest T. Carter, Charles S. Fairchild, Solomon Hanford, Charles E. Lydecker, C. C. Overton, H. de Raasloff, Louis T. Romaine, Professor Munroe Smith and Everett P. Wheeler. A permanent organization was effected, officers were elected and by-laws adopted, one of which stated the object of the Association to be "to oppose the extension of political suffrage to women in New York."

An executive committee was elected and the following were added to the rolls and elected members of this committee:—Messrs. John R. Dos Passos, Geo. Douglas Miller, John C. Ten Eyck and Dr. Talcott Williams. Headquarters of the Association were opened and have since been maintained at 27 William Street, New York City, and a campaign for membership instituted.

Much valuable literature has been distributed throughout the United States. Several public meetings were held under the auspices of the Association, its chairman took part in the Carnegie Hall joint debate, and a committee of the Associa-

tion successfully opposed at Washington, before the House Committee on Rules, the proposal to create a committee on woman suffrage. Messrs. Wheeler, Dos Passos and Ten Eyck argued before that Committee. The Association also opposed the suffrage amendment to the United States Constitution, which was considered by the Senate Judiciary Committee. Copies of the briefs were distributed to the members of the Senate and the House, as well as to the members of this Association.

The Association proposes now to make a still more vigorous campaign. To do this it is planned to enlarge the membership by enrolling members in every part of the United States, so that woman suffrage and all that it involves may be interpreted and understood by every voter and every woman in the land.

The membership of the Association is made up of three classes: sustaining, dues \$5 a year; active, dues \$1 a year, and associate, no dues required. The Association also proposes to co-operate with "THE REPLY," and THE REPLY will co-operate heartily and continuously with the Association. Each sustaining and active member of the Association will have a copy of this magazine for his own library table and for the information of his friends.

If interested, please sign and return to the address given below:

"I desire to join the Man-Suffrage Association Opposed to Political Suffrage for Women as

An Active Member, dues \$5 a year;

A Sustaining Member, dues \$1 a year or upwards at option of member;

An Associate Member; (any man or woman who indicates his or her approval of the objects of the Association).

Name

Address

Please make checks payable to

MAN-SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION 27 William St., New York City